

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

FIGS. 1 and 5 have been amended to address the issues raised in Form PTO 948 attached to the Office Action. Two formal drawing Replacement Sheets for these figures are attached hereto.

Status of Claims

Claim 1 has been amended, new claims 5-12 have been added and no claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-12 are pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration.

This amendment adds and changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 are rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,999,939 ("De Hilster") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,700 ("Larsen"). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Hilster in view of Larsen and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,438,515 ("Crawford"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, insofar as they may be applied to the pending claims, for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 12 recite a method (or system or software) that automatically preprocesses a resume to determine a language of the resume and then determines a resume type based on the determined language of the resume. A template is then selected corresponding to the determined resume type for a determined language so that intelligent template processing of the resume is achieved. The processing intelligence is very different both based on the language of the resume and on a resume type (for example, corresponding to different job boards) and selecting a template based on both of these determination captures and utilizes this intelligence. For example, name or address syntax

may differ significantly based on both the language of the resume and the formats of different resume types (such as corresponding to particular job boards). Accordingly, the claimed invention provides efficient resume processing that takes advantages of unique intelligence provided by the template selection based on both a resume language and type. At least these claimed feature is not taught or suggested by the applied prior art.

Specifically, *De Hilster* focuses on the unstructured text to data form transformation and especially on a feedback loop where the author of the document goes back and manually corrects and modifies the submitted document. *Larsen* is concerned using data stored in a database to automatically fill out data fields of multiple forms and is really the opposite of the claimed invention in which intelligently selected templates are used transfer normalized data into a database. Neither of these references (nor their reasonable combination) discloses or suggests the claimed preprocessing of a resume to determine a language of the resume and then determine a resume type based on the language determination so that an appropriate template is automatically selected to normalize the resume. Furthermore, neither does *Crawford* cure the deficiency of the applied combination since Crawford is concerned with comparing units of thought or chunks in different languages and does disclose or suggest the claimed specific preprocessing steps for resume normalization. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 11, and 12 are patentable over the applied references.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional features which are also patentable when considered as a whole.

For example, claim 5 recites using a default template for each language based on the determined language. Claim 6 recites that the default template includes a group of keywords associated with each fieldname so that resume content can be associated with a fieldname when any of the alternative keywords are searched and found in the resume content as recited in claim 7. These recited features are also not disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art and provides additional reasons for the patentability of these claims.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is courteously invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 27, 2003

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (858) 847-6715

Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 41,398

Attached: Two (2) formal drawing Replacement Sheets for FIGS. 1 and 5